AF

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/357,737	07/19/1999	ALESSANDRO SETTE	18623-01400	9669

50710 7590 11/15/2005

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX, P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVE.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
SCHWADRON, RONALD B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/357,737	SETTE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *166,168,170 and 177* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *166,168,170,177* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 166,168,170,177 are under consideration.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).
Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 166,168,170,177 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of copending Application No. 10/031345. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons. While the two sets of claims differ in scope, claim 1 of 10/031345 recites the peptide GVAGALVAFK whilst claim 5 discloses said peptide linked to a T helper (HTL) epitope. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant has indicated that this issue would be addressed at a later date.

4. The rejection of claim 170 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention for the reasons elaborated in the previous Office Action is withdrawn in view of the amended claim 170.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 170 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chien et al. (US Patent 6,150,087).

Chien et al. teach a peptide that comprises GVAGALVAFK (see column 27, second paragraph, AA1850-1900, wherein said peptide refers to amino acids in Figure 66 (sheet 107) and wherein said peptide comprises GVAGALVAFK). Chien et al. disclose said peptide conjugated to tetanus toxoid (see column 26, first paragraph) wherein tetanus toxoid inherently contains HTL epitope(s). The "conjugate is" and "epitope is linked" are considered open language (equivalent in scope to comprising) and therefore the claim encompasses GVAGALVAFK attached to other HCV amino acids and further attached to tetanus toxoid.

Regarding applicants comments, The "conjugate is" and "epitope is linked" are considered open language (equivalent in scope to comprising) and therefore the claim encompasses GVAGALVAFK attached to other HCV amino acids and further attached to tetanus toxoid as per taught by Chien et al.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 166,168,170,177 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chien et al. (US Patent 6,150,087) in view of Berzofsky et al. (US Patent 5,980,899) in view of Guo et al. Applicants arguments have been considered and deemed not persuasive.

Chien et al. teach a peptide comprising the peptide of claim 166 (see column 27, second paragraph, AA1850-1900, wherein said peptide refers to amino acids in Figure 66 (sheet 107) and wherein said peptide comprises GVAGALVAFK). Chien et al. teach said peptide can be conjugated to tetanus toxoid (see column 26, first complete paragraph). Virtually any intact immunogenic molecule will contain at least one helper cell epitope. Chien et al. also teach a composition containing said peptide and a carrier (see column 26, first complete paragraph). Chien et al. do not teach the peptide of claim 166/168. Berzofsky et al. teach that it is desirable to identify CTL epitopes found in HCV (see column 2, fourth paragraph). Guo et al. teach that CTL recognize viral peptides complexed with MHC (see page 364, first column, last sentence continued on next page). Guo et al. teach that said peptides which bind HLA-Aw68 generally are 9 to 11 amino acids with a V at P2 (position 2) and a K at the c-terminal position. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have created the claimed invention because Chen et al. teach an immunogenic HCV peptide containing GVAGALVAFK, whilst Berzofsky et al. teach that it is desirable to identify y CTL epitopes found in HCV and Guo et al. teach that CTL recognize viral peptides complexed with MHC and that peptides which bind HLA-Aw68 generally are 9 to 11 amino acids with a V at P2 (position 2) and a K at the c-terminal position. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to create the claimed peptide to screen for HCV peptides which were recognized by CTL because Berzofsky et al. teach that it is desirable to identify CTL epitopes found in HCV and Guo et al. teach that CTL

recognize viral peptides complexed with MHC and that peptides which bind HLA-Aw68 generally are 9 to 11 amino acids with a V at P2 (position 2) and a K at the c-terminal position.

Regarding applicants comments, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to create the claimed peptide to screen for HCV peptides which were recognized by CTL because Berzofsky et al. teach that it is desirable to identify CTL epitopes found in HCV and Guo et al. teach that CTL recognize viral peptides complexed with MHC and that peptides which bind HLA-Aw68 generally are 9 to 11 amino acids with a V at P2 (position 2) and a K at the c-terminal position. Regarding applicants comments about Berzofsky et al., the Chien et al. reference discloses that the sequence comprising GVAGALVAFK contains a HCV epitope (see column 27, first paragraph). Regarding Berzofsky et al. and NS5, Berzofsky et al. does not teach that NS5 provides the only CTL epitope in HCV. Berzofsky et al. indicate that CTL epitopes would be present in other regions of HCV (for example see column 13, first paragraph and column 12, second paragraph). Regarding applicants comments about Guo et al. and 9mer peptides, said comment is made regarding the prior art. It is not a comment regarding the results disclosed by Guo et al. Guo et al. teach that peptides which bind HLA-Aw68 generally are 9 to 11 amino acids with a V at P2 (position 2) and a K at the c-terminal position (see abstract).

Regarding applicants comments about the properties of the peptide of claim 166, the MPEP section 2145 (II) states:

II. ARGUING ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGES OR LATENT PROPERTIES
Prima Facie Obviousness Is Not Rebutted by Merely Recognizing Additional Advantages or Latent Properties Present in the Prior Art

Mere recognition of latent properties in the prior art does not render nonobvious an otherwise known invention. In re Wiseman, 596 F.2d 1019, 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979) (Claims were directed to grooved carbon disc brakes wherein the grooves were provided to vent steam or vapor during a braking action. A prior art reference taught noncarbon disc brakes which were grooved for the purpose of cooling the faces of the braking members and eliminating dust. The court held the prior art references when

combined would overcome the problems of dust and overheating solved by the prior art and would inherently overcome the steam or vapor cause of the problem relied upon for patentability by applicants. Granting a patent on the discovery of an unknown but inherent function (here venting steam or vapor) "would re-move from the public that which is in the public domain by virtue of its inclusion in, or obviousness from, the prior art." 596 F.2d at 1022, 201 USPQ at 661.); In re Baxter Travenol Labs., 952 F.2d 388, 21 USPQ2d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (Appellant argued that the presence of DEHP as the plasticizer in a blood collection bag unexpectedly suppressed hemolysis and therefore rebutted any prima facie showing of obviousness, however the closest prior art utilizing a DEHP plasticized blood collection bag inherently achieved same result, although this fact was unknown in the prior art.).

"The fact that appellant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious." Ex parte Obiaya, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985) (The prior art taught combustion fluid analyzers which used labyrinth heaters to maintain the samples at a uniform temperature. Although appellant showed an unexpectedly shorter response time was obtained when a labyrinth heater was employed, the Board held this advantage would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art.). See also Lantech Inc. v. Kaufman Co. of Ohio Inc., 878 F.2d 1446, 12 USPQ2d 1076, 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 1058 (1990) (unpublished — not citable as precedent) ("The recitation of an additional advantage associated with doing what the prior art suggests does not lend patentability to an otherwise unpatentable invention.").

In re Lintner, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972) and In re Dillon, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1990) discussed in MPEP § 2144 are also pertinent to this issue.

In addition, the peptide of claim 166 is found in the larger peptide taught by Chien et al. (associated with other naturally occurring HCV amino acids) wherein Chien et al. teach

that said larger peptide is immunogenic. Furthermore, the functional attributes of the peptide of claim 166 would presumably be present in the peptide of Chien et al. in that said larger peptide would be processed in vivo to yield the peptide of claim 166. Regarding applicants comments about Yewdell et al., there is no evidence of record that suggests that the peptide taught by Chien et al. contains another immunodominant epitope that would suppress the response to the peptide recited in the claims. Furthermore, if the peptide recited in the claims is an actual physiologically relevant CTL epitope than the larger molecule containing said epitope must be processed in vivo to result in said peptide. In addition, the specification discloses that the peptide can be 30 amino acids long (see page 37) and conjugated to a HTL, indicating that according to the teachings of the specification, there is no criticality regarding the length of the peptide. Regarding Del Val et al. said reference refers to a peptide containing a CTL peptide and exogenous sequences not naturally found associated with the CTL peptide. The peptide taught by Chien et al. contains only naturally occurring HCV sequences. Regarding Eisenlohr et al., said reference actually teaches that flanking sequences can also positively effect the presentation of an immunogenic peptide (se page 484, first column, last paragraph). There is no evidence of record that addresses the effect of the flanking sequences found in the peptide disclosed by Chien et al.

9. No claim is allowed.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached at 571 272 0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644

RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800 1644